

Does Pressure Increase or Decrease Active Gravitational Mass Density?

Abhas Mitra*

MPI fur Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany[†]

(Dated: February 7, 2008)

It is known that, for a static fluid sphere, the General Relativistic (GR) Effective Mass Energy Density (EMD) appears to be $(\rho + 3p/c^2)$, where ρ is the bare mass density, p is the isotropic pressure and c is the speed of light, from a purely localized view point. But since there is no truly local definition of “gravitational field”, such a notion could actually be misleading. On the other hand, by using the Tolman mass formula, we point out that, from a global perspective, the Active Mass Energy Density is $\sqrt{g_{00}}(\rho + 3p/c^2)$ and which is obviously smaller than $(\rho + 3p/c^2)$ because $g_{00} < 1$. Then we show that the AGMD eventually is $(\rho - 3p/c^2)$, i.e., exactly opposite to what is generally believed. We further identify the AGMD to be proportional to the Ricci Scalar. By using this fundamental and interesting property, we obtain the GR virial theorem in terms of appropriate “proper energies”.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q, 04.20.Cv, 04.40.Dg

Keywords:

Let us consider a static self-gravitating fluid sphere described by the metric

$$ds^2 = g_{00}(r)dt^2 + g_{rr}(r)dr^2 - r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \quad (1)$$

Here θ and ϕ are usual angular coordinates. The radial coordinate r is the luminosity distance or areal radius. While the coordinate volume element is $dV = 4\pi r^2 dr$ the proper volume element however is $d\mathcal{V} = \sqrt{-g_{rr}} dV$. Note that since $-g_{rr} > 1$, $d\mathcal{V} > dV$. The energy momentum tensor of the fluid in mixed tensor form is

$$T_k^i = (p + \rho)u^i u_k + pg_k^i \quad (2)$$

Here g_k^i is the metric tensor, u^i is the fluid 4-velocity, p is the isotropic pressure, ρ is the total mass energy density excluding any self-interaction and, hence, the *bare* proper mass energy density. If e is the total proper internal energy density, ρ includes e : $\rho = \rho_0 + e$ where ρ_0 is the proper “rest” mass energy density not associated with any active energy. Here we take $G = c = 1$ unless G and c appear specifically. The total mass energy appearing in Kepler’s law, i.e., the gravitational mass of the body is

$$M = M_g = \int_0^R \rho dV \quad (3)$$

where $r = R$ defines the boundary of the *isolated* body having $p = 0$ for $r > R$. This total mass energy is also known as *Schwarzschild mass* of the fluid. But it was shown by Tolman[1] and Whittaker[2] that there could be another definition of M . For any stationary gravitational field, total four momentum of matter plus gravitational field is conserved and independent of the coordinate system used[1, 2, 3]:

$$P^i = \int (T^{i0} + t^{i0}) dV \quad (4)$$

where t^{ik} is the energy momentum pseudo-tensor associated with the gravitational field. Further, the inertial

mass (same as gravitational mass), i.e., the time component of the 4-momentum of any given body in GR can be expressed as[1, 2, 3]

$$M = M_i = \int_0^\infty (T_0^0 - T_1^1 - T_2^2 - T_3^3) \sqrt{-g} d^3x \quad (5)$$

where $g = -r^4 g_{rr} g_{00} \sin^2\theta$ is the determinant of the metric tensor g_{ik} and $d^3x = dr d\theta d\phi$. Since

$$T_1^1 = T_2^2 = T_3^3 = -p; \quad T_0^0 = \rho \quad (6)$$

it follows that[1, 2, 3]

$$M = \int_0^\infty (\rho + 3p) \sqrt{-g_{00}g_{rr}} dV = \int_0^\infty (\rho + 3p) \sqrt{g_{00}} d\mathcal{V} \quad (7)$$

When the body is *bound* and $p = \rho = 0$ for $r \geq R$, then, the foregoing integrals shrink to[1, 2, 3]

$$M_i = \int_0^R (\rho + 3p) \sqrt{g_{00}} d\mathcal{V} \quad (8)$$

This expression for $M = M_i$ widely gave rise to the idea that the Active Gravitational Mass Density (AGMD) is $(\rho + 3p)$ and hence pressure contributes positively to the AGMD. Note that in Newtonian gravity, the *bare* proper mass energy density is just $\rho_{Newton} = \rho_0$. But, in GR, the same is $\rho_{bare} = \rho = \rho_0 + e$. Further, if the adiabatic index of the fluid is γ , in GR, the proper *bare* mass energy density is $\rho_{bare} = \rho_0 + (\gamma - 1)^{-1}p$. Thus the fact that pressure would contribute positively to the effective mass energy is *already* taken into consideration by the very definition of GR bare mass density. In fact, one sees that pressure contributes practically linearly, almost on equal footing to the inert rest mass density.

One may argue that since the RHS of the Einstein equation: $G_k^i = (8\pi G/c^4)T_k^i$ involves not only ρ , but also p , there must be additional *positive* contribution of p in

AGMD over and above what is hidden inside ρ . First, such a view is imprecise because the Einstein equations are non-linear and connected to each other in a subtle and complex manner which may defy such a “common sense”. And if pressure would strictly contribute to AGMD in a *positive* manner there must not be any resistive action associated with pressure and, consequently, there would be no hydrostatic equilibrium at all. Further, if pressure must contribute to ρ on equal footing because both are ingredients of energy-momentum tensor, it follows from Eq.(6), that *pressure should contribute to AGMD in a negative manner* because the signs of T_0^0 is *opposite* of those constituting pressure! And this observation would be in tune with the notion that in order that there is a hydrostatic balance, it is necessary that, from global view point, pressure acts as a resistive element. In general, one expects the AGMD to be determined as the *clothed* mass density obtained after accounting for all *global* self-interactions of the *bare mass* which includes both rest mass and pressure contributions. Since such global interaction energies are necessarily negative, one does not expect the AGMD to be larger than the bare mass density. Therefore, the interpretation that

$$\rho_{AGMD} = \rho + 3p > \rho_{bare} \quad (9)$$

is puzzling.

Note that $M_g = M_i$ is the total mass-energy perceived by distant inertial observer S_∞ . Thus, the proper interpretation of Eq.(8) is that while $\rho + 3p$ appears to be purely *locally* defined total mass energy density, it need not represent the true AGMD obtained after considering *global* negative self-interactions. Thus we may call $(\rho + 3p)$ as the local Effective Mass Density (EMD). On the other hand, only the unique global inertial frame S_∞ can perceive the true AGMD obtained after accounting for global self-interactions. Indeed, a careful, examination of Eq.(8) shows that, the actual AGMD appearing in Tolman and Whittaker’s mass is

$$\rho_{AGMD} = (\rho + 3p) \sqrt{g_{00}} \quad (10)$$

This may be further confirmed by noting that the Poisson Equation, in this case[4], is

$$\nabla^2 \sqrt{g_{00}} = 4\pi G \sqrt{g_{00}} (\rho + 3p) \quad (11)$$

Since Poisson equation should indicate the true AGMD, it becomes clear that it is indeed $\sqrt{g_{00}} (\rho + 3p)$. Further, in the presence of mass energy, $g_{00} < 1$, and hence it is less than $(\rho + 3p)$. Now, let us see whether $\rho_{AGMD} < \rho_{bare}$ in accordance with the fact that global self-gravitational energies, either due to rest mass or internal energy or pressure or any other source of mass energy is *negative*. In fact, we trivially verify this in the following:

Note that the volume element dV appearing in the Eq.(3) is *not the proper element* dV . To see the proper

AGMD after inclusion of self-energies, one must express M in terms of proper volume element:

$$M_g = \int_0^R \rho dV = \int_0^R \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{-g_{rr}}} dV \quad (12)$$

By the weak Principle of Equivalence (POE), the gravitational mass M_g appearing in the foregoing equation must be equal to the “inertial mass” M_i , the temporal component of P^i appearing in Eq.(8). Then, by comparing these two equations, we directly find that

$$\rho_{AGMD} = (\rho + 3p)\sqrt{g_{00}} = \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{-g_{rr}}} \quad (13)$$

Since in the presence of mass energy, $\sqrt{-g_{rr}} > 1$, we directly verify from Eq.(13) that

$$\rho_{AGMD} < \rho \quad (14)$$

because of all pervasive negative self-interactions. It may be recalled here that the total *proper* energy content of the sphere, by excluding any negative self energy contribution[4, 5, 6, 7], i.e., the energy obtained by merely adding the *bare masses* is

$$M_{proper} = M_{bare} = \int_0^R \rho dV \quad (15)$$

Obviously, $M < M_{bare}$ because $dV < dV$, and the difference between the two constitutes the *conventional* definition GR self- gravitational energy of the body [4, 5, 6, 7]

$$E_G = M - M_{bare} = \int_0^R \frac{(1 - \sqrt{-g_{rr}})}{\sqrt{-g_{rr}}} \rho dV \quad (16)$$

Since $\sqrt{-g_{rr}} > 1$ in the presence of mass energy, E_G is a -ve quantity, as is expected. Thus irrespective of the subsequent discussions, we have *already* shown in a trivial and direct manner that $\rho_{AGMD} < \rho$ from a global perspective. Now we proceed to find a more precise form of ρ_{AGMD} .

Note that the E_G defined by Eq.(16) is the sum of appropriate local (proper) quantities somewhat like the definition of M_{bare} in Eq.(15); and is not defined with respect to the unique inertial observer S_∞ [4] who alone can define global energies from the perspective of energy conservation. Note also that, in contrast, the gravitational mass M_g and inertial mass M_i are indeed the mass-energy measured by S_∞ . Accordingly, it was shown recently that the appropriate value of the *global* self-gravitational energy as perceived by the unique inertial observer sitting at spatial infinity (S_∞) is different[4]:

$$\tilde{E}_g = \int_0^R (\sqrt{-g_{00}g_{rr}} - 1) \rho dV \quad (17)$$

The static GR scalar virial theorem, as perceived by the unique inertial frame S_∞ and obtained by merely demanding $M_g \equiv M_i$ [4] is

$$\tilde{E}_g = - \int_0^R 3p \sqrt{g_{00}} dV \quad (18)$$

This means that the effective energy density of self-interaction, as perceived by S_∞ is simply

$$\rho_{self}^\infty = -3p\sqrt{g_{00}} \quad (19)$$

And since all *proper* energy densities are higher by the blue shift factor of $1/\sqrt{g_{00}}$, the *proper density of global self-interactions* is

$$\rho_{self} = \frac{\rho_{self}^\infty}{\sqrt{g_{00}}} = -3p \quad (20)$$

Therefore, the net *proper clothed* mass density is

$$\rho_{clothed} = \rho_{bare} + \rho_{self} = \rho - 3p \quad (21)$$

and which is none other than the (negative of) *trace* of the energy momentum tensor:

$$\rho_{clothed} = -T_i^i = -T \quad (22)$$

Since the AGMD is the net clothed mass density after accounting for all positive and negative sources of mass energy, we must have

$$\rho_{AGMD} = \rho_{clothed} = -T \quad (23)$$

Had we used a different metric signature, we would have found, $\rho_{AGMD} = T$. Let us rewrite:

$$\rho_{AGMD} = \rho_0 + (\gamma - 1)^{-1}p - 3p \quad (24)$$

Essentially pressure (also ρ_0 and e) remains submerged in ρ while this self energy is evaluated and *does not couple separately to field*. In fact, the same is true in a Newtonian case too where there is no “weight” with pressure. Even if the we would have had $\rho_{AGMD} = \rho + 3p$ (in tune with prevalent notions), it would have been incorrect to interpret the $3p$ term as directly due to the “weight” of pressure. Had it been so, we would have had just $\rho_{AGMD} = (\rho + p)$ rather than $\rho + 3p$! Of course, in such a case, we would have had completely ignored the all self-interactions in the determination of AGMD.

It would be more interesting to express this fundamental fact in terms of the Ricci Scalar $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\rho_{AGMD} = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \mathcal{R} \quad (25)$$

Conversely, we discover here the fundamental physical significance of the Ricci Scalar, a very important *invariant* of the problem:

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \rho_{AGMD} \quad (26)$$

And this observation is in strong agreement with more general theorems on positivity of gravitational mass[8, 9, 10]. As a result of this study, we obtained here the

expression for “Active Gravitational Mass” for the static spherically symmetric fluid

$$M = M_{AGM} = \int_0^R (\rho - 3p/c^2) dV \quad (27)$$

It may be remembered however that $M_g = M_i = M_{AGM}$, and it would be naive to look for a separate “pressure contribution” in AGM or in anything. What really contributes here (negatively) is “self-interaction” (to “bare mass” M_{bare}).

For weak Newtonian gravity, we may directly verify Eq.(27) by starting from the very definition of M_i in Eq.(8). In the Newtonian case, we have

$$\sqrt{g_{00}} = 1 + \psi \quad (28)$$

where $\psi \ll 1$ is the Newtonian gravitational potential. Following Tolman[1], we may now split Eq.(8) into 4 terms by using Eq.(28):

$$M_i = \int \rho dV + \int \rho \psi dV + 3 \int p dV + 3 \int p \psi dV \quad (29)$$

From Eqs.(19) and (28), note that the strict expression for the Newtonian self-gravitational energy is

$$E_g^N = - \int 3p dV - 3 \int p \psi dV \quad (30)$$

Now using Eq.(30) in (29), we find that

$$M_i = \int \rho dV + \int \rho \psi dV - E_g^N \quad (31)$$

But the original definition of self-interaction energy is[1]

$$E_g^N = \frac{1}{2} \int \psi \rho dV \quad (32)$$

where the factor of (1/2) comes because otherwise mass pairs would be counted twice. By using Eq.(32) into (31), we have

$$M_i = \int \rho dV + 2E_g^N - E_g^N = \int \rho dV + E_g^N \quad (33)$$

i.e., the AGM is indeed the clothed mass after accounting for the (negative) self-interaction. Again using Eq.(30) into the foregoing Eq., we obtain

$$M_i = \int \rho dV - 3 \int p dV - 3 \int p \psi dV \quad (34)$$

Since in the Newtonian case, $p/c^2 \ll \rho$ and $\psi \ll 1$, the last term in the foregoing equation drops out to ensure that

$$M_i = \int \rho dV - 3 \int p dV = \int (\rho - 3p) dV \quad (35)$$

Tolman too obtained the same relation in a somewhat less accurate way (see p.250 of Ref[1]). An absolutely correct derivation of Eq.(27) is not obtainable in the Newtonian case because of its inherent approximations. In contrast, the result (27) was obtained in a strictly correct manner without Newtonian approximations.

In the strict Newtonian case, one does not associate any mass equivalence with either p or e or E_g^N . Hence, the real AGMD, $(\rho - 3p/c^2)$, does not appear in the Newtonian Poisson equation:

$$\nabla^2\psi = 4\pi G\rho \quad (36)$$

Further, note that in this case $\rho = \rho_0$ banishing all energies from the notion of AGMD. However, in a Post Newtonian approximation, $(\rho - 3p/c^2)$ rather than $(\rho + 3p/c^2)$ must replace ρ in the foregoing equation.

The recently obtained GR virial theorem[4] involves global quantities as measured by the unique inertial observer S_∞ . However, for astrophysical purpose, it would be more convenient to have a virial theorem which would involve conventional “proper” measure of self-gravitational interaction E_g described in Eq.(16). Now we show that it is indeed possible to have this desirable astrophysical virial theorem by again equating M_g of Eq.(12) with M_{AGM} of Eq.(27):

$$\int \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{-g_{rr}}} dV = \int (\rho - 3p) dV \quad (37)$$

By recalling Eq.(16), one can easily manipulate the foregoing the above equality into

$$E_G + 3 \int p dV = 0 \quad (38)$$

This is the desired GR virial theorem for a static spherically symmetric fluid.

In summary, we found that

- Positive pressure of course adds to the locally defined total mass energy density ρ by lifting it from its inert value ρ_0 to $\rho = \rho_0 + (\gamma - 1)^{-1}p$. This however does not mean that the AGMD is necessarily boosted by p .

- the AGMD $(\rho/\sqrt{-g_{rr}})$ is indeed lower than the bare mass density ρ because of all pervasive negative self-interaction of all sources of gravity like “rest mass density” and “internal energy”. Pressure too contributes to this interaction albeit via the internal energy. The reduction of AGMD in the presence of and internal energy and, hence, in the presence of pressure may physically be seen as “buoyancy” acting upon the “bare mass” immersed in a fluid.

- The question posed in the title of the paper is in accordance with the current way of thinking in the community and it is *ill posed* or at best naive. The more

appropriate question would have been whether pressure contributes to AGMD at all and

“Do self-interactions contribute positively or negatively to the Active Gravitational Mass Density?”

As we found the $(-3p)$ term in the AGMD is not actually due to mere pressure, on the other hand, it reflects the entire effect of self-interactions. While calculating the self-interactions, both p , ρ_0 and e remain submerged within ρ rather than coupling independently to ρ or anything else. In the same vein, p contributes positively too to AGMD by through the ρ term.

- The result that AGMD decreases in a medium because of interactions is in agreement with corresponding results in nuclear and condensed matter physics.

- The present study concerns *isolated* objects where g_{00} could be uniform within the fluid only if it would be unphysically considered that $p \rightarrow 0$. In such a case, $\nabla^2\sqrt{g_{00}} \rightarrow 0$ so that Poisson equation (11) would demand both $\rho = 3p = M \rightarrow 0$.

The case is different in cosmology where one necessarily has an uniform $g_{00} = 1$ despite having arbitrary pressure and EOS. However, the present discussion is valid for the segments of the universe.

- We discovered here a fundamental result for a static spherical fluid: The Ricci Scalar is directly proportional to AGMD. This may have far reaching interesting consequences beyond the present study.

- Finally we obtained a new and elegant form of GR virial theorem for a static spherical fluid which would be of potential importance in Relativistic Astrophysics.

* Electronic address: Abhas.Mitra@mpi-hd.mpg.de

† Also at Theoretical Astrophysics Section, Bhabha Atomic Research Center, Mumbai-400085, India

- [1] R.C. Tolman, *Relativity, Thermodynamics & Cosmology*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1962), also, Phys. Rev., 35, 875 (1930)
- [2] E. Whittaker, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 149, 384 (1935)
- [3] L.D. Landau & E.M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 4th ed., 1975)
- [4] A. Mitra, Phys. Rev., D74, 024010 (2006), gr-qc/0605066
- [5] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation*, (John Wiley, NY, 1972)
- [6] H.A. Buchdahl, Phys. Rev., 116, 1027 (1959)
- [7] R.F. Tooper, ApJ., 140, 434 (1964)
- [8] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau, Phys. Rev. Lett., 43, 1457 (1979)
- [9] C.-C.M. Liu and S.T.-Yau, Phys. Rev. Lett., 90, 231102 (2003)
- [10] R. Bartnik, Phys. Rev. Lett., 62, 2346 (1989)